

be inoperable. Applicants claim the authentication code is sent to the destination unit before authentication is determined. In effect, the authentication code is a challenge to the user to return the same code to confirm the user's identity. As such, claim 1 also requires authenticating the user when the returned authentication code matches the sent authentication code. In Crane, Crane's yes/no answer is returned after authentication of the requestor has already taken place. This is set forth, for example, in column 5, lines 33-35 where it states "Upon receipt, the application server processes the response as required and as a result knows the user is to be given access."

In contrast to Crane and its teachings, Applicants claimed method utilizes authentication as determined with the successful comparison of the returned authentication code and the sent authentication code. In addition, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 55-64 of Crane as allegedly supporting the rejection of the claim. However, in this cited portion, Crane appears to teach away from the Examiner's suggested modification by stating "It is assumed that the client has obtained the authentication data from its associated authentication device." Crane makes no suggestion that the authentication data can be obtained from anywhere other than from its associated authentication device. Moreover, FIG. 1 of Crane clearly shows the authentication device to be an element of the client device.

Claim 6 is allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 10 is allowable for similar reasons and also because the cited portion of Crane does not refer to using a primary wireless channel in combination with a wireless back channel as claimed. The office action cites column 1, lines 25-39 and column 6, lines 1-14. These cited portions are silent as to the use of any back channel and in fact, column 1, lines 25-39 actually refers to the primary communication channel. The portion cited in column 6, lines 1-14 only refers to different authentication device types and does not appear to mention anything about a wireless back channel or use of a primary channel in combination therewith

with the other limitations set forth in the claim. As such, if this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing by column and line number of each of the limitations set forth in claims 10 and 15.

Claims 17 and 21 are allowable at least for the same reasons given above with respect to the other corresponding independent claims and as such, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane in view of Bellare et al. Applicants respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to the Crane reference and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/05

By: Christopher J. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005